

REMARKS

This application pertains to a novel method for color correction of dental restorations or artificial teeth.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are pending; claims 3, 6, 9 and 12 being cancelled by this amendment. In addition, the limitations of claim 12 have been added to claim 1, making all the remaining claims method claims.

Applicants note with appreciation the spelling errors in claims 8 and 11 (diglycidil) pointed out by the Examiner in Claims 8 and 11, and have now made the necessary corrections.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schaefer (US 5,009,597). The Schaefer reference pertains to artificial teeth, and materials used in forming them. Nowhere in this reference is there to be found any teaching or suggestion of a method for adjusting the color of dental restorative parts by applying any dental coating to them, let alone Applicants' special dental coating. The Schaefer reference cannot therefore reasonably be seen as anticipating or suggesting Applicants' claims. The rejection of claims 1, 3, 7, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schaefer (US 5,009,597) should accordingly now be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lee, Jr. et al (US 4,150,485). Lee, Jr. et al pertain to a method of repair only, however, and neither teaches nor suggests anything at all about **adjusting** the color of a dental restoration. Applicants' claims cannot therefore be seen as anticipated by or obvious over the Lee, Jr. et al reference, and the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lee, Jr. et al (US 4,150,485) should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Koblitz et al (US 4,411,625). The Koblitz reference pertains to dental restorative techniques only, however, and neither teaches nor suggests anything at all about **adjusting** the color of a dental restoration. Applicants' claims are therefore neither anticipated by nor obvious over this reference, and the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S. C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Koblitz et al (US 4,411,625) should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 7, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stange et al (US 6,881,360 and/or its counterpart EP 1,243,230). The Stange reference pertains to only a method and material for **producing** dentures, and has absolutely nothing to do with adjusting the color of a dental restoration. The rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 10 and 12

under 35 U.S. C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stange et al (US 6,881,360 and/or its counterpart EP 1,243,230) should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stange et al (US 6,881,360 or EP 1 243 230 A2). As discussed above, Stange has nothing to do with color restoration, and there is nothing to be found anywhere in this reference that would teach or suggest anything about adjusting the color of dental restorations by the application of a dental coating material thereto. Applicants' claims cannot therefore be seen as obvious over this reference, and the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stange et al (US 6,881,360 or EP 1 243 230 A2) should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as obvious over Stange et al (US 6,881,360) and Holmes (US 6,030,606). The differences between Applicants' claims and the Stange reference are discussed above.

The Examiner relies on the Holmes reference for a teaching of bisphenol A acrylates and methacrylates. Neither of these compositions could possibly overcome the differences pointed out above, however, and the rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as obvious over Stange et al (US 6,881,360) and Holmes (US 6,030,606) should now be withdrawn.

Claim 1 stands rejected for obviousness type double patenting over claim 1 of

U.S. Patent 6,426,373. The present amendments have distanced the present claim from the claims of the '373 patent and the obviousness type double patenting rejection is obviated by those amendments. The rejection of claim 1 for obviousness type double patenting over claim 1 of U.S. Patent 6,426,373 should accordingly now be withdrawn.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stange et al (US 6,426,373). The Stange reference pertains to materials and dental kits, however, and does not teach or suggest anything at all about Applicants' method of adjusting the color of dental restorative parts. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stange et al (US 6,426,373) should therefore now be withdrawn.

In view of the present amendments and remarks it is believed that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of said claims by the Examiner is respectfully requested and the allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Applicants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account

No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS

By /William C. Gerstenzang/
William C. Gerstenzang
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/tmo

875 Third Avenue- 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 808-0700